

REMARKS

The objection to claim 21 has been corrected.

Claim 1, for example, was rejected over the combination of Hidary in view of Parasnis. Claim 1 calls for advising a website hosting facility sufficiently before video information containing a uniform resource locator is distributed to a receiver of the resource locator in order to enable the facility to prepare for an increased access load. For example, when the video information, in the form of a television program, is broadcast to a large number of receivers and all those receivers receive the program and the URL, they may all attempt to access that URL at the same time. Thus, the website hosting that URL is advised of the impending broadcast so that they can prepare to handle the increased load.

It is conceded on page 3, first full paragraph, that Hidary teaches no such thing. Likewise, Parasnis teaches nothing pertinent to the claimed invention. Of the numerous cites to Parasnis, only two of those casually mention URLs. There is no suggestion anywhere in Parasnis that the website hosting facility be advised of an impending broadcast of a program citing a URL which is hosts. The citations in the office action to column 17 and 18 mention URLs, but not in this context. The other citations are devoid of any mention of URLs, but do discuss, for example, the possibility that a user who desires to broadcast a presentation does not have the bandwidth or servers available to handle it and would have the option to select a net show provider. See column 14 of the cited reference. But this has no relationship to notifying a website of an impending demand for its services. It has nothing to do with notifying anybody about anything. There is no suggestion in either of the cited references of warning a website hosting facility when a program is about to be broadcast, including a URL that points to a website hosted by that website hosting facility.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims is respectfully requested.

On the same basis, the rejection of claim 11 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered.

Similarly, the rejection to claim 21 should be reconsidered for the same reason.

In view of these remarks, the application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 27, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Timothy N. Trop', is written over a horizontal line.

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]